

**REMARKS**

By this Amendment, Applicant hereby adds claims 4 and 5, which are supported throughout the specification. Accordingly, claims 1-5 are all of the claims pending in the application.

**I. Formal Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning copies of the PTO/SB/08 forms submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on August 7, 2006, August 14, 2008, and April 28, 2009, indicating consideration of the documents cited therein.

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 03/104884 to Lecain et al. (hereinafter "Lecain"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

***Claims 1-3***

Applicant respectfully submits that the Lecain reference discloses a conventional display device that is very different from the display devices according to exemplary embodiments of the claimed invention as shown in FIGS. 4(a), 4(b), and 5 of the instant application.

Applicant respectfully submits that the beads 572 and 574 (alleged spacers) shown in FIG. 17 of Lecain are structurally and functionally distinct from the claimed spacers. For example, the beads 572 and 574 prevent extrusion of the sealing material according to Lecain (*see* page 42, lines 9-12 of Lecain), rather than strengthening a resin substrate.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lecain does not disclose or suggest the spacers 15 provided in the sealing agent arranging portion 14 between the outermost walls of partition walls

4 and the rib 12, which strengthen the resin substrate, as shown in an exemplary embodiment in FIG. 4(b) of the instant application.

Applicant hereby amends claim 1 to recite, “the sealing agent arranging portion is disposed between outermost walls of partition walls for forming cells and a rib disposed on at least one of the front substrate and the rear substrate.” Applicant respectfully submits that Lecain cannot be construed to disclose or fairly suggest spacers that are disposed between the claimed outermost walls of partition walls and the claimed rib. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Lecain.

Applicant also amends claims 1-3 for purposes of clarity.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 3 are patentable over Lecain at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

### ***Claim 2***

Additionally, with respect to claim 2, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s contention that Lecain discloses, “the spacers are manufactured simultaneously when partition walls for forming cells between the substrates are arranged on the substrate.” Applicant respectfully submits that Lecain is silent with respect to the manufacturing of beads 572 and 574 as related to the arranging of the partition walls on the substrate.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is separately patentable over Lecain at least for this reason, as well as by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

### ***Claim 3***

Finally, with respect to claim 3, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s contention that Lecain discloses “a total area of the spacers on the substrate is 0.5 - 50 % of the

sealing agent arranging portion on the substrate.” The Examiner points to disclosure related to a different type of seal which does not even employ the beads 572 and 574 (alleged spacers), and thus the disclosure cannot possibly teach a total area of the spacers on the substrate is 0.5 - 50 % of the sealing agent arranging portion on the substrate.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is separately patentable over Lecain at least for this reason, as well as by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

### III. New Claims

Applicant hereby adds claim 4, which is supported throughout the specification, *e.g.*, in FIGS. 4(b) and 5 and paragraphs 0020 and 0022.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is separately patentable over Lecain at least because Lecain does not teach or suggest that “the spacers have a dotted shape,” as recited in claim 4, as well as by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

Applicant also adds claim 5, which is supported throughout the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is patentable over Lecain at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

### IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric S. Barr/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Eric S. Barr  
Registration No. 60,150

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 18, 2009